## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION DOCKET NO. 3:07-cy-00255-W

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
Plaintiff,	) )
vs.	
SAKIMA IBAN SALIH EL BEY,	) ) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
and	) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
JUDITH A. GIBSON, in her official capacity as REGISTER OF DEEDS for Mecklenburg	) )
County, North Carolina,	)
Defendants.	) ) )

THE MATTER is before the Court on Defendant El Bey's "Injunctive Declaratory and Prospective Relief for Judicial Review to Vacate Order/Amendmed [sic] Court Order, Affidavit Affecting Alleged Lien" (Doc. No. 30).

The caption in the motion identifies the undersigned, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Adden and reads "We, the People, Sakima Iban Salih El Bey Preamble Citizen of the United States, National of the United States v. Robert Conrad Magistrate United States District Court, Robert S. Adden Jr., Paul Taylor, Frank Whitney." In sum, Defendant El Bey argues that the undersigned conspired with Paul Taylor (counsel for Plaintiff) and Robert S. Adden, Jr., (counsel for Defendant Gibson) and that the Order and Amended Order (Docs. Nos. 26, 28 respectively) entered in this matter is "unconstitutional on its face, and contrary to RICO, Alter Ego Doctrine, Article I, sec. 19 Constitution of North Carolina inter alia." (Doc. No. 30, p. 4). Defendant requests injunctive and declaratory relief by way of a declaration that the orders entered in this case be declared null and void. Defendant also seeks "prospective relief" such that those named in the caption be "prevented and stopped" from entering any order or any action against "any Citizen" including Defendant El

Bey. (Doc. No. 30, p.5). Because the motion fails to present any conceivable reason to support the

outrageous relief sought by Defendant, it is summarily denied.

Defendant's motion is another example of Defendant El Bey's "continuous abuse of the

judicial process by filing meritless and repetitive actions." Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc., 390

F.3d 812, 817-18 (4th Cir.2004) (quoting Brow v. Farrelly, 994 F.2d 1027, 1038 (3d Cir.1993)). As

noted in the Court's Amended Order, Defendant has a long history involving prolific and

indiscernible litigation. The motion now before the Court is no different. It is vexatious and filed

without good faith but for the sole purpose to harass the counsel and judge involved in the case. By

filing this frivolous motion, Defendant El Bey has caused needless expense and burden to the Court

and the parties. The Court has already enjoined Defendant El Bey from filing any liens or

encumbrances against judicial officers in the Western District of North Carolina without first seeking

and obtaining approval from this Court. Apparently, this was insufficient to deter Defendant El Bey

from continuing his abusive conduct. Accordingly, the Court finds that further action by the Court

may be necessary under these facts.

Recognizing the principles set forth in Cromer, the Court hereby ORDERS Defendant El Bey

to SHOW CAUSE why the Court should not impose a pre-filing injunction (1) on Defendant in this

matter and (2) in future matters Defendant El Bey may seek to file against judicial officers in the

Western District of North Carolina. Defendant El Bey shall limit his response to these two specific

inquiries ONLY, and the Court will disregard any irrelevant argument. Defendant shall submit its

response no later than March 14, 2008. Failure to submit a timely response may result in a pre-

filing injunction being issued against Defendant El Bey regarding filings in this matter and in future

related matters.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Defendant's motion (Doc. No. 30) is DENIED.

Defendant is ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE by March 14, 2008, why a pre-filing injunction limited

to the two instances set forth above should not be issued against him.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: February 29, 2008

Frank D. Whitney

United States District Judge

Thithey